

Number and Name of Revenue Village : 38-Saram.

DR. S.B. DEEPAK KUMAR, I.A.S.,
Special Secretary (Revenue).

$$\begin{aligned} & \S\ddot{A}\ddot{A}_i\ddot{n} \text{ } \mathfrak{p}\hat{A}\hat{i}\hat{l} \text{ } \mathfrak{z}^{\ddagger}, \\ & {}^{\circ}\S\mathfrak{S}_i \text{ } \S\ddot{A}\ddot{o}\tfrac{1}{4}i\mathfrak{S} \text{ } \ddot{A}\acute{A}\mathfrak{c}_i\tfrac{1}{4}\ddot{o}, \\ & \mathfrak{O}\hat{D}\hat{i}\mathfrak{S}^{\circ}_i\mathfrak{c}_9. \qquad \dots \pm\tfrac{3}{4}\mathfrak{c}\acute{A}\hat{U}\tfrac{3}{4}_i\ddot{A}^{\circ}. \end{aligned}$$

17. þó ʒ ÚÁÉð%ø - üÄð%ç | °öÄöÄĬ ð ° | %Éĭ ü
- Äē ĭ ĭ ö ÄÖðÄ Ä" . | %ĭ %Ä" %ÄÄĭ ö . - Äē ĭ ĭ ö
- Ä. Ä. %ĭ . " Çð %Äĭ ÷ | °öÄ%ĭ ø Äĭ Ð. ĭðð . ÄÖĒ
« " ÄöÐ | %ĭ ÄÄĭ Çç Ü ĭ ĭ ÄÄö" Öð « Äç öðððð ÄöÄĬ
ÄÖ. ÇÐ. | %ĭ ÄÄĭ Çç Çç S. ĭ ĭ . " Çðð ʒ çÄĭ ö
z ü. Äö" Ä ±ý Ü ÜÜö ÜüÜ ÄÜĭ öÄĬ. ÇÐ.

« Çá, òÀÎ ò ±ýÚ ÇéÁ, ò ÛÈç « í¹Éð « Çá, Óý Áó¼ SÁ;Ð, |¼;ÆÁ;Çç ù òðÀÇð |ÀÈ ÁÚð¼¼;ø Ì¼¼ð Ì¼;Á;Áý ã Äð |¼;S°; Á « ÛðÀðÀð¼Ð. òðÀÇ - Á× ÁúÚð òðÀÇ °Á;ð× ÁúÈç 16-4-2012 « ýÚ Ç¼¼¼ SÁ;Í Á;ð Ì¼;Á;ø ÇéÁ, ò |°;ýÉ °Á, ÒðÐ, Ç ÁÁ |¼;ÆÁ;Çç ù ðüÜì |¼;ñ ¼É÷.

26. ¼Ä Ì Û, Ä, Äð¼ÄÌ ÁðÎ SÁ ÞÓð¼;Öð |¼;Æü°í, ò ÄÄ¼ÇÇ Üì Ì Á½ð |¼;Ì ðÐ |°ðÈð |Äñ ð |°ðÀð SÁ;Á¼; ÇéÁ, ò ÄÄðÈÄ¼; SÁ; ÁúÚð ð¼Ä |¼;ÆÁ;Çç, Ç S°ðÐÌ |¼;ÜÇð SÁ;Á¼; SÁ; °í, ¼ç ù Þð Á. |°ðÈð |Äñ ð |¼; Ì ÁÖðÀð - ùÇÄ÷, ù ÁÄÄ;ð ±É « ÈÄðð ÄÄ, Äø, ñ ÈÖð¼Ð. °Á÷ ðüÜì |¼;ÜÇ;Áø òð¼ð¼ÄÌ ò ðÈðÄ;É |°Äø, Çø ®Í ÄðÎ - ùÄð¼ÄÌ Ä; ò ðüÄÌ ò¼ÄÐ¼ý ¼; ù S, |¼; Ì Û, ÇéÁ, ò Á½ð SÁñ Î ò ±ýÚð « Øð¼ð |¼;Ì ò¼É÷. 9-5-2012 « ýÚ Ç¼¼¼ Ö Ûð¼ð¼ø ÇéÁ, ÞÄÌ Ç Á ÁçÁý ±ýÈ |¼;ÆÁ;Çç¼ÜÇ ÓÄü°ðÐ ¼;Ì Ì ¼ø Ç¼¼É÷.

27. 11-5-2012 « ýÚ |¼; Ä 9.30 Á½ç Ó¼ø Á; Ä 6 Á½ç ÁÄ SÄÄ;ñ Á SÄÄ;Ç÷ ÁúÚð - ùÄð¼Ç SÄÄ;Ç ÄÖð, SÄÄ;Ç;ý « ÈÄø òð¼ð¼ÄÌ ò ðÈðÄ; « Ì¼ðÐ Äð¼É÷. « ¼ýÄÈÌ, ÄÄÖ È SÄ;Í Á;ð Ì¼ Ç¼¼¼ø « Ä÷, Ç ÄðÎ Ì Ì |°ðÄ « ÛÄ¼ø¼É÷. Äø Ð ÈÌ Ì Ì, |¼; ¼ð¼;ø, Ì ò ÄÇ Ç× ÇÌ °ð¼Ä, SÇ;ð ò ±ýÚ SÄÄ;Ç÷, Ç ÄÄðÈÈ÷. « Ì ò¼ Ç;Ü, « ó¼ SÄÄ;Ç÷ ù Á½ç ÄÄ ÁÚð¼É÷. 12-5-2012 « ýÚ ¼Ä ðÎ òÄ;ðÎ SÄÄ;Ç Ä ÄÄð « ÈÄø ÄðÐ ÄÄðÈÄ¼;ø ÁÚÇ;Ü « ÄÖð Á½ç ÄÄÄø Ä.

28. S, Ç¼;Ä, ÁúÇÇ ÁÉf; ÁúÚð ÞÄÌ, Ä; - SÄ; ÁúÈ "SÄ" Ä ÇÜð¼ð¼ø ®Í Ä¼¼¼ |¼;ÆÁ;Çç, Ç "à ñ ÈÄ¼;ø Á½ç |°ð¼ Þ¼ð¼ø « Ä¼ÄøÄ;¼ ÝúÇç Ä - ÖÄ; ÄÐ. Þó¼ð |Äñ |¼;ÆÁ;Çç ù - ùÄð¼ÇSÄÄ;Ç Ä; Ä ¼ø |°ðÐ ¼Ä Äø - ð; Ä |°;ýÉ; ù. SÄÖð, S. ÁÉf; ±ýÈ |Äñ |¼;ÆÁ;Çç ¼;SÉ ¼;Ì ÇðÐì |¼;ÜSÁý ±ýÚð « òÄÈÌ |°ðÐ |¼;ñ ¼;ø, ÇéÁ, ÞÄÌ Ç÷ ÁúÚð SÄÄ;Ç÷ °ç ÈÄø ¼üÇðÄÍ Ä÷ ±ýÚð ÛÈÇ;÷. 14-5-2012 « ýÚ V. ÁúÇÇ ÁúÚð I. ÞÄÌ, Ä; - SÄ; Á½ç |°ððð Á½ç Ä;Ç÷, Ç, « Äà È; ò SÄ°Öð « Ä÷, Çý Äø ÞÖðÐ Á½ç Äø ÄÄýÄÍ ò¼ÄÍ ò - ð¼; Çð ÄÄ í, Öð ÁúÚð Áý °;Äð ¼ð Ðñ ÈðÐð Á½ç |°ðÄ Ä¼;Áø ¼Ä ò¼É÷.

29. Ì Èð¼, Äð¼ÄS, ¼Ä Ì Ûð ÞÖð¼¼;ø, Á½ç Ä;Ç÷, Ç ÄÄð¼Äø Ä. ð¼Ä |¼;ÆÁ;Çç, Ç Ç ÄÄÄÌ ò SÇ;Ì, ðÐ¼ý |°ðÈð |Äñ ð ±ýÈ « ÈðÄ" Äø |¼;Æü°í, ò¼ÈÖÌ Á½ð |¼;Ì, Äø Ä. « Ä¼ÄøÄ;¼ ÝúÇç ÄÄÖð¼;ø - ùÐ È Äç;Ä ½ Ç Ì ÄÈÄø Ä. - È;ø, Ì ¼Ä; |°ðÈð |Äñ ð |¼; Ä, Ä SÄ; ÄÄ Äð « ÛðÀðÀð¼Ð.

30. ¼Ä Ì Ûð Ì ò ÄÈÌ 25-6-2012ð Áñ Î ò |¼;Æü°í Ä ¼ÄÈ, òÄð¼Ð. - È;Öð, |ÄÐ SÄ Ä ±ýÈ SÄ Ä ÇÜð¼ð |¼;¼÷ð¼Ð. ÄÇÇ;°;Ä òðÀÇð ÁðÎ ò ¼ÄÌ ÜÌ ò ±ýÚ ÇéÁ, ò ÛÈÇ;¼;ø, °Á |¼;ÆÁ;Çç ù òðÀÇð Ä;Í, ÁÚð¼¼;ø, |¼;S°; Ä Ä¼¼ð ¼Ä;ø ã Äð òðÀÇð « ÛðÀðÀð¼Ð. ÄÜ¼;Ä, ù òð¼ð¼ÄÌ ò ðÈðÄ;É Ç¼ÄÈÌ Çø ®Í Äð¼¼;ø, « Ä¼Ä;É ÝúÇç Ä ðüÄÌ ò¼ SÄñ ÈÖð¼ÇÐ. « ¼É;ø ÄðÎ SÄ - ò¼ÄÄ;¼ð S, ÄðÀð¼S¼ ¼ÄÄ Á½ç ÄÜÌ, òÄ¼ Äø Ä. ÇéÁ, ò ±ó¼ÄÄ;É òð¼ð¼ÄÌ ò ðÈðÄ;É Ç¼ÄÈÌ ÇÖð ®Í Ä¼Äø Ä. ÞðÁÜÄÄÌ ÄÄ; Ä½ð ðÐ×ð Þð Ä, ÞðÁÜ ¼ÜÜÄÈ |°ðÀð¼ SÄñ Î ò.

31. ÞðÁÜÄø ¼£×Ì ±ðð ±ðÄÉ;Ì, ù:

ÁÜ¼;Ä÷ ¼ÄðÀø, ÁÜ¼;Ä÷ I. ÞÄÌ, Ä; ±ýÄÄ÷ Á.°;1- |¼;¼÷ñ 29/2012ð Äç;¼, òÄðÎ, Á.°;1- 1 Ö¼ø 74 - Á½ç Ç; Ì ÈÄÈ |°ðÀðÀð¼Ð. ÁÜ¼;Ä÷ V. ÁúÇÇ ±ýÄÄ÷ Á.°;1- |¼;¼÷ñ 30/2012ð Äç;¼, òÄð¼;÷. ÁÜ¼;Ä÷ S. Ç¼Ä; ±ýÄÄ÷ Á.°;1- |¼;¼÷ñ 31/2012ð Äç;¼, òÄð¼;÷. ÁÜ¼;Ä÷ A. ÁçÁý ±ýÄÄ÷ Á.°;1- |¼;¼÷ñ 32/2012ð Äç;¼, òÄð¼;÷. ÁÜ¼;Ä÷ S. ÁÉf; ±ýÄÄ÷ Á.°;1- |¼;¼÷ñ 33/2012ð Äç;¼, òÄð¼;÷. Þó¼ 5 ÁÜ¼;Ä÷ Çý ÜüÚð SÄ°í, ¼ç ÇÌ ÈÄ, ÇÈÈ. - ¼Ä;ø, Þó¼ 5 ÁÜÌ, Üð Üð¼; Äç;Ä ½ |°ðÀðÀð¼Ð, ÁúÚð |¼;¼÷ñ 29, 30, 31, 32 ÁúÚð 33/2012ð E. Íó¼Ä ð¼Ç±ýÄÄ÷, Á.°;2- Äç;¼, òÄð¼;÷.

±¼ÄÜ¼;Ä÷ ¼ÄðÀø, |¼;¼÷ñ 29, 30, 31, 32 ÁúÚð 33/2012ð ±¼ÄÜ¼;Ä÷ ÇéÁ, ò¼Çý, P. °í ¼SÄø ±ýÄÄ÷ ±Ä.°;1- Äç;¼, òÄðÎ, ±.°;1- 1 Ö¼ø 42 - Á½ç Ç; Ì ÈÄÈ |°ðÀðÀð¼ÇÐ. M. Ä;Ä;fç ±ýÄÄ÷ ±Ä.°;2- Äç;¼, òÄðÎ, ±.°;1- 43 Ö¼ø 55 - Á½ç Ç; Ì ÈÄÈ |°ðÀðÀð¼ÇÐ. S. Ö¼ø ½ý ±ýÄÄ÷ ±Ä.°;3- ×ð, L. Í, ýÄ; ±ýÄÄ÷ ±Ä.°;4- ×ð, P. - ñ ¼;Ü ±ýÄÄ÷ ±Ä.°;5- ×ð Äç;¼, òÄð¼;÷, ù.

Þó¼ðÐÄÜÌ, ÇÖð Üð¼; Äç;Ä ½ |°ðÀðÀð¼ È 13-3-2013 « ýÚ ÞÖð¼ð ÄÈÌ Ä÷ Çý òðÀð¼Ç SÄ;ø ¼;ø |°ðÀðÀð¼ ÜðÌ Ì ÈðÄ; ½ Ä¼¼ |°ðÀðÀð¼ Ä;Ðð¼Äø ÄÈÌ, òÄÈ, ÈÐ.

±ðÄÉ;Ì, ù:

(1) ÞðÁÜÌ, ù ðü, ò¼; Ð ¼;É;?

(2) ±ðÄ;Ç; Äð ÁÜ¼;Ä÷, Üì Ì |¼;¼ Ì ò?

32. ±ðÄÉ;Ì, ù 1 ÁúÚð 2:

ÁÜ¼;Ä÷ Üì Ì Áñ Î ò Á½ç |¼;¼÷ñ °ç ÁúÚð Óð òðÀÇðÐ¼ý, Þ¼Ä ÖÜ Ü¼ý Á½ç ÄÈÌ, SÄñ Î ò ±ýÚð, ðÐÌS°;ç « Äøý |¼;ÆÁ;Çç ù °;÷ð¼ ÇéÁ, Ç ÄÖð, |¼;ÆÁ;Çç Ç Ä òð¼; Çý ÄÈ ¼ñ ÈÌ, SÄñ Î ò ±ÈÌ SÇ;Ç ÞðÁÜÌ Ç ÁÜ¼;Ä÷, ù ¼;ø |°ðÐüÇÈ÷. ÞðÁÜ¼;Ä÷, ù ¼ÄÌ Ì |¼;¼, SÄñ ÈÄ - ÇÄ, Üì |¼;¼, 2011 Ö¼ø ÄøSÄÜ SÇ;Ç Ç « ÇðÐ « ¼ý SÄ;ø

à n Ê SÂ. Ä ÇÜðððððð Ì ¼ | òð¼ Ò Àç×
|¼|ÆÄjÇ÷, Çç | òð¼, Äðð ÄÊÄððð ±ý Üð,
À½ç ÇSÄððð À½ç | òðÄ¼¼ Ò Àç× |¼|ÆÄjÇ÷, ù
ÀjðÏ, ù ÀjËi |, jñ Ï ò, SÂ. Ä ÇÜðððððð
Ì ¼|¼¼¼÷, Ç ÄððËi |, jñ Ï ò, Ì òÄÄj, Äðð
ÇÄj, À½ç ÄjÇ÷, Ç À½ç | òðÄ ÄÄjÄðð¼ òð¼¼
Äj÷ð¼ SÄüÄj÷, ÄÄjÇ÷ ÄüÜð SÄÄjÇðð Äðð
À½ç ÄÄjÄðð òðð¼¼ ±ý Üð, ±í, ù - üðð¼ç
Äj¼¼, òðððð ±ý Üð, þiÝúç Äðð 15-5-2012ð
¼¼ òðð | òðððððð ±ý Üð Ì Êðððððð¼¼÷.

38. SÄðð, þð¼ Ýúç ÄÄjð, 5 |¼|ÆÄjÇ÷, Üi Ì
À½ç ÇÏ, - òð¼ 22-5-2012 « ýÜ ÄÄj, òðð¼¼¼ ×ð,
SÄðð òð¼ |¼|ÆÄjÇ÷ ù òððððð ò ðÊðÄj, SÂ. Ä
ÇÜðððððð Ì ¼|¼¼¼ òðð òð¼¼¼ òð¼¼¼ ÄÜðð,
À½ç ÄÜi, òðð¼¼¼, òðð « òðð Òý ÄÜ
|, jÏ òð¼¼, ù ±ý Üð, þüÄç, Äi, Ç Ä Òðð þðÄÜ
¼¼, ò òððððð¼¼, Ì Êðððð ùçj÷, ±¼ÄÜ¼¼Ä-
ÇÄj, òð¼¼ ÄüË òjððç ÇjË ±Ä.º.2 Óð ±Ä.º.5
÷, SÄjðð ±Äj.º.1 ý Üü Ë « Üjðð ÇÄj, òðð Ì
ºj¼, Äj, òjððÄçð¼¼÷.

39. ÄÜ¼¼Ä÷ ¼Äðð « ÊÄj÷ð¼ ÄÄj Ì Ì Ä » ÷
Äj¼¼, Äðð Äj÷ 15 Äð¼¼, Üi Ì SÄÄj, À½ç ðjðð
|¼|ÆÄjÇ÷, Üi Ì SÄj¼¼ òðððð « Çð Äð Ì Ä
±ý Üð « ÄÊð òð¼, ù S. jð¼, Ç ÄððÜðð¼
|¼|ÆÄjÇ÷, ò 26-3-2012ð - Äððð, òðð¼¼¼ ×ð,
|¼|ÆÄjÇ÷, òð¼¼ ÄÄÄj, ÄððÄÜ S. jð¼, Ç
ÇÄj, òðððð ò ÄüÜð « ÄÏ ð Ë « Çç jç Üi Ì ò
Óý Ì Äðð¼¼¼ ×ð, ðËÇjÄ, Ó ËÄð òð¼, ù
S. jð¼, Ç Óý Äi Ì ò SÄjð þ¼ |ÄjÜðði
|, jÜçj¼ ÇÄj, ò |¼|ÆÄjÇ÷, ù Äð |ÄjðÄjË
Ì üËi òðð, Çi ÍÄðð¼ |¼|ÆÄjÇ÷, ò òðð Àçð,
« ðÄð - ¼¼, ÄÄ Ó Ë, Çi Äjñ ¼¼¼ ×ð,
- Êjðð, ¼¼ òðð ±ý Üð Ì ÄÄjð |¼|ÆÄjÇ÷, Ä Ä
ä Ê À½ç òð¼¼ òj, jðð òðððð Äñ ð |¼¼, Ä
|, jÏ Ì, ÓÄüðð¼ ÇÄj, òððð Ì Ä¼Äð Ì Ä
±ý Üð ÄððÄÜ |¼|ÆÄjÇ÷, ÄjÜ, ù Çð ÄÄð
þðÏi ò SÄjð ÄçjÄ ½ÄçËç5 |¼|ÆÄjÇ÷, Ç
À½ç ÇÏ, ò òððð òjÇðÄ ±ý Üð SÄðð
7 |¼|ÆÄjÇ÷, Ç òððððð ò ðÊðÄj, À½ç ÇÏ, ò
ÇÄj, ò òððð òjÇðÄ Ä ±ý Üð Ì òðð Äð¼¼.
ÄÜ¼¼Ä÷, ù ¼Äðð Ì - ¼ÄÄj, ð, ñ ¼ Óý ¼ðð, ù
Çç É × ÜÊððð¼¼.

M/s. Chidambaram Shipcare Pvt. Ltd., - Vs. - The Presiding Officer, Principal Labour, Chennai.

... Whenever, the workmen go on strike, the trade union should issue notice as per the conditions of service and in the case of public utility service, it is a must for issuing notice on strike by the unions. Section 33 of the Act provides protection to the office bearer of the trade union from being victimised by the employer, while disputes are pending adjudication or conciliation. Thus, the scheme of the Act provides a pivotal role for trade unions.

It is relevant that section 3 of the standing orders for certification, the Certifying Officer shall forward a copy thereof to the trade unions and to hear the trade unions in the certification proceedings. Thus, the trade union is given a right to be heard, while framing the conditions of service of the workmen. While submitting draft standing orders, section 3 of the Standing Orders Act contemplates that the draft standing orders shall be in conformity with the model standing orders. Section 4 of the Act makes it clear that it is the duty of the Certifying Officer to adjudicate on reasonableness of the provisions of the standing orders. Hence, while certifying any standing orders, the Certifying Officer, taking into account the above principles, should ensure that the workman is given assistance by the office bearer of the trade union in the domestic enquiry, to which the workman is a member....

Supreme Court of India M/s. Lokmat Newspapers PVT. Ltd., - Vs. - Shankarprasad. Date of Judgment: 19-7-1999.

... It is not in dispute in this case that the respondent invoked the jurisdiction of the Labour Court which was competent to deal with his complaint regarding unfair labour practice, under items 1 (a), (b), (d) and (f) of Schedule IV of the Maharashtra Act. Section 7 of the Act lays down the duties of Labour Court and states as under:- It shall be the duty of the Labour Court to decide complaints relating to unfair labour practices described in item 1 of Schedule IV and to try offences punishable under this Act....

Workmen of Bata India Limited, - Vs. - The Commissioner of Labour and The... ILR 2007 KAR 615.

... Therefore, without holding an enquiry and without providing an opportunity to show cause to the unilateral deduction of pro rata wages from the monthly wages payable to the employees is opposed to the principles of natural justice.

In the absence of terms of settlement, deduction can be made from the wages payable to an employee as specified in section 7 of the Payment of Wages Act, Firstly, the provisions of Payment of Wages Act do not apply to the workmen in question since all of them are drawing more than Rs.1,600 as wages per month. Further, section 7 of the Payment of Wages Act do not specify deduction of pro rata wages on the ground of go-slow work. Therefore, in the absence of any provision in the settlement and also any statutory provision, it is not open for the 2nd respondent to deduct wages on pro rata basis on the ground of go-slow work....

40. ±¼ÄÜ¼¼Ä÷ ¼Äðð « ÊÄj÷ð¼ ÄÄj Ì Ì Ä » ÷
Äj¼¼, Äðð, ÇÄj, ò òðððÄÊ, ¼Ä òðð
| òððÜç¼¼ ×ð, òðððÄÊÄjË SÂ. Ä ÇÜðððððð
ÄÜ¼¼Ä÷, ù Ì Ä¼Äð Ì Ä ±ý Üð |¼|ÆÄjÇ÷, ò òð¼
÷, Äi, ÇÄj, ò òðððÄj, Çð ±ý Äð òjÇðÄ ±ý Üð

41. | ¼|Æŋi 01 Å¼œ 0 ý Êœú Á.º. - .5 ã Äö
26-3-2012 « ý Ů, | ¼|Æŋi 01, ö Å¼œ | °ö Å¼ü |
Óý ðö Àœý ðö « ÊöÄ - ¼ S, | | ä " " Ç Óý
" Äö ¼¼|, × ö Þ¼" Êö | Ä| Üö ðì | |, ü Ç | ¼
¿ Ä|, ö | ¼|ÆÄ| Çç Çœ S, | | ä " " Ç ²ü,
ÄÜö ð ÄÆÄ| í | ö ¼ÄÊi " " Ç SÄü |, | ñ ¼¼|, × ö
ÄÜ ¼Ä: ¼Äö « ÊÄ| : ö ¼ÄÊi " " Ä» ÷ ± Î ö ð " Äö ¼Ä:
21-11-2011 S¼¼Äö ¼ S, | | ä " " ÄÜ Á.º. - .6
- Î ö. Þì S, | | ä " " Ä ²ü, | ¼ ¿ Ä|, ö 15-5-2012
« ý Ü Á.º. - .7 Ä| - « × ð S¿ ðÊS | |, Î ö ¼œ É ÷
30-5-2012 « ý Ü °ÄÄö « ÖÄÄ| œö ö, | ÷
« Çä, ö Äö ¼¼|, × ö « ¼ý SÄ| œ ÞÖ¼Äö - Äö ö
« " Êö ð Äö | | œ Ä ÷ ± ý Ü ö, Þö ¼Ä | ¼|Æŋi 01,
¼ÄÊi " " Çö | Ä| Üö ðì | |, ü Ç | Äö | ¼|Æŋi
01, ö ¼œ | °Äö Äö ¼ | ¼|ÆÄ| Çç, " Ç Þ¼Ä| ü Êö
| °ö ðö Äü Üö ð " Ê Ä| ü Êö | °ö ðö Äü Üö ¼ü, | Äç
Ä½ç Ä| ü Êö | °ö ðö Äü Üö ¿ Äö ¼Ä Ä½ç Ç | |, ö
| °ö ðö, SÄ| Äç..œ °Ä | ¼|ÆÄ| Çç ü Äö ö, | ÷
| °ö Ä ¼ÄÊi " " ± Î ö ðö ¿ Ä|, ö ÄÆÄ| í |, Ä¼ü, | Ê
- ¼Ä| Äö Á.º. 9 Ö¼œ Á.º. 66 Ä - ÄÄ| í ö ± Ê × ö,
SÄÖö ÄÜ ¼Ä: ü ¼Äö Äö Ì Êö Äö ö Äö Äi ü Ç ð.

45. SÄÖö, þóð | ¾;Æü¾, ÄjÈø | ¾;¼÷óÐ
2-2-2012 Ä· ÄÄÄ SÄiÄj÷ð· ¾, ü ¿ ¼|ÄüÈ¾ø
SÄ· Ä ¿Üó¾ø | °Ð Äó¾ | ¾;ÆÄjÇ÷, ü ±ó¾Äø
¿Äó¾· ÈÖÄøÈc 10-11-2011 Ö¾ø Ä½ qÄ
ÄÖÄ¾j, ´ðöi | j, ñ ¼¾j, ¿ÆÄj, ö ÜÈÄ¾j,
12-12-2011 « ý Ü °Ä° « ÖÄ÷ Ì ÈöÄø - üÇÐ.
°öÄÇ - Ä÷× ÄüÈÇSÄiÄj÷ð· ¾Äø Öý SÈüÈö
þÖÄj¾¾jø - üÇÖöð SÄjÄjð¼ö 19-8-2011 Ö¾ø

2-2-2012 « ŷ Ů ¾ÄÖ× ÷, Û Ì ũ Í Ó, Á, ŠÀ°
 ¾£ ×, ½ ð Æ ÷ ¾, Ä Ů Ö× Ì Ä°¾₄
 ±.°.-.3 ¾ÄÖ¾, Ä Ů °Ä° « ÖÄ÷ Öý
 ÖË, ð Æ ð.

[illegible]

47. 3-3-2012 « ý Ú 7 |_¼ĚÄ;Ç÷, û ŠÄ" Ä
 ÇÚó¼ó¼ø ®Ī Äð¼ |_¼ĚÄ;Ç÷, Çø ÄŠÄ;¼ø
 ŠÄ;ì " Ī ÈòÄø¼ ð, ÷, Ě¼Ī, û ±.°ĵ. - .9 - Ī ò
 þì, Ě¼Ī, Çø |_¼ĚÄ;Ç÷, û ÄĪ Í Çĵ, ®ŠÄ;ç
 Äç ð¼ÄÄĵ, ½ç Äç °ĵó¼ç ±Š. °ĵó¼ç Ě. °ÄĪ, ÄuÜò
 Ò. ÇÄ;¼ðÄĵ, û -, ŠÄ;÷, û Ä½ç ŠÄ;ð¼ø Ä½ç Äø
 « Ī, " Ě |°Öð¼ĪÄø Ä½ç |°öÖð |_¼ĚÄ;Ç÷, " Ç
 |ÄÐ ŠÄ" Ä |°öÖð ÄĚ à ñ ÈÖð, ÄÄðÈÖð
 « ÖÄÖì, ð¼Ī, Äĵ÷ð " ¼, Çĵø ¼øÈÖð
 Ī ÈòÄøĪ Û Çĵ÷, û. - üÄð¼çĪ " ÈöÐ þÆð ðüÄĪ ðÐð
 |_¼ĚÄ;Çç û Ä½ç Çĵ, ð |°öÄðÄĪ Ä÷ ±Ě
 « ÈÄöÄÄ" Äø, ñ ¼ 3-3-2012 Š¼¼Äø¼, Ě¼
 Ç, ø ±.°ĵ. - .10 - Ī ò. ¼ÄĪ, ðĪ ðÄĵðĪ Ð" ½ ŠÄÄ;Ç÷
 - ñ ¼ĵ, û ±ýÄÄ÷ 3-3-2012 « ý Ú ÇÄĵ, ð¼çĪ
 « Çø¼ð, ÷ ÄuÜò « ¼ý « ÈðÄ" ¼Äø « Çç, ðÄð¼
 ð, ĵĵ Ç, ø ±.°ĵ. - .11 - Ī ð.

48. °ð¾ÄÄj ½ çÓ¾ø ¿Ä¿¾öÄj ü Ä ¨ ÄÄjÉ 7
|¾jÆÄjÇç ¨ Çð ¾ü, jÄ¿ ½½ç¿, ö |°öÄöÄ½ö
SÄjÄ¾j, ¨ ð¾öÄð¾ « ÈÄöÄ¿ ¿, ø ±.°j. - .12
±É × ö, 2-3-2012 Ó¾ø |ÄÐ SÄ ¨ Ä |°öÐ ÄÖÄ¾jø
- üÄö¾çl ¨ ÈöÐ SÄjÉ¾j, × ö, þl |°Äö |¾j¼-ö¾jø
¿¾ÄÈl ¨ , ±l l, öÄl ö ±É ±.°j. - .13 ä Äö
« ÈÄöÄ ¨ Ä ¨ , Äø 7-3-2012ø ¨ ð¾öÄð¾¾¾j,
ñ ÈÖl, ÈÐ. ¨ üÄö¾çSÄÄjÇ÷, Ö%½ý ±ý ÄÄ÷
14-3-2012 « ý Ü Ä½ö Äjñ ¨ Á SÄÄjÇÖl l
« Çö¾ ±.°j.14, È¾ö¾ø, Ó¾ø shiftø |¾jÆÄjÇ÷, ü
|ÄÐ SÄ ¨ Ä |°ö¾¾j, × ö, SÄÖö, j ¨ Ä 6 Ä½ö Äl
|¾j¼l l ö SÄ ¨ Ä ¨ Ä 9 Ä½ö Äl |¾j¼l, Èj÷, ü
±ý Üö, þ¾ É S, ð¾ SÄjÐ « öÄÈö¾jý |°öSÄjö
±ý Üö SÄÖö ¾ðÈl S, ð¾jø « Ä ¨ Ä « ÈöÐ
Äl l, ü ±É, ñ l üÇÐ. °Äö « ÖÄÖÖl l ¿Äj, ö
14-3-2012 S¾¾Ä, È¾ö¾ø |¾jÆÄjÇ÷, ö ¾ °j÷ö¾
|¾jÆÄjÇç ü |ÄÐ SÄ ¨ Äöø 2-3-2012 Ó¾ø

ʀÎ ʌðÎ ûÇ¾¼jø - üʌð¾¼ç ʌÇ ¾¼jî°jǺ « ÊðÀʌ° ¼ʌð
 ÁðÎ şǺ °ðʌÇð ¾¼ððʌÎ ð ±ý Ŭð şǺŬð ççʌj.ð
 ²ü.ÊşǺ ç¾¼¼ð¾¼ð þʌÎ ,çǺŬǺ¾¼j, ×ð ±.°j.¬.15ø
 Ì ÊðʌçðʌðÎ ûÇÐ.

49. 2-3-2012 Ó₄₀ - üÄò¾Ä Á | ÄDÄ_j | °öÄi
 | °j, øÄcÄüEÄ÷, Ü ö « üÄ_jSË | °öD ÄÖ, & EË÷
 ±ý Üö « ¾E_jø - Äi ì ö ÄüEÄ÷, Ü i ì ö Ä_jÜ₄₀
 - ò¾Ä× ÄËöÄq, öÄI, ËD ±ý Ü ±Ä_j.°j.16 ä Äö
 ÄcfÄý, ÄÄ_j, %o, ÄÄö¾Äý, « ýÄE, ý, °ö¾ÄS°, Äý,
 ¾ÄS « ÄD, | Äi, S¾°ý - Ä 8 ¿Ä÷ ü | ÄD
 SÄ - Ä | °öÖö, jÄ½ö¾ÄE_jø - üÄò¾ÄÄq ÄÄÖöD
 ÄÄ_jÄ_jöÖ Äq×ì Ä_jÜ₄₀ | °öÄ¾Ä_j, ÄËöÄö¾Ä
 12-3-2012 ÄüÜö 14-3-2012 S¾¾Äö¾Ä - ò¾Ä×, ü
 ±.°j. - .16 - ì ö. - üÄò¾Ä°jÄÄ¾Ö, SË_jö ±ý Ü
 ¿ÄÄ_j, ö¾Äö ÜËÄ¾Äý SÄ_jö 19-2-2012 ÄÜ
 Ä_jÜ₄₀ | °öD - ò¾Ä× ÄËöÄö¾Ä - ò¾Ä× ±.°j. - .17
 - ì ö.

50. $p \pm \tilde{S}^3 \circ \tilde{a}$, $\dot{\Lambda} \dot{J} \dot{D}$, $\dot{i} \dot{o} \ll \ddot{O} \ddot{A} \ddot{A} \div 27-3-2012$
 $\dot{A} \dot{u} \dot{U} \dot{o} \div 29-3-2012$, $\dot{A} \dot{J} \dot{D}$, $\dot{C} \dot{o} \div \frac{3}{4} \dot{A} \dot{E} \dot{o} \div \ddot{A} \dot{A} \dot{o}$
 $\dot{\Lambda} \dot{J} \div \ddot{A} \dot{A} \dot{o} \frac{1}{4} \frac{3}{4} \dot{o}$ 86 $\frac{3}{4} \dot{A} \dot{E} \dot{o} \dot{J} \div \dot{U} \dot{i} \dot{I}$ $p \pm \tilde{S}^3$
 $\circ \dot{O}$, $\dot{A} \dot{u} \dot{U} \dot{o}$ $\dot{\Lambda} \dot{E} \dot{o} \frac{3}{4} \dot{u}$ $\dot{u} \dot{C} \dot{D}$ $\pm \dot{y} \dot{E}$ $\dot{I} \dot{E} \dot{o} \dot{D}$
 $\pm \circ \dot{J} \div .18$ $\dot{I} \dot{o}$. $\frac{3}{4} \ddot{A}$ \dot{A} $\frac{3}{4} \dot{A} \dot{E} \dot{o} \div \ddot{A}$ $\dot{u} \dot{o} \dot{A} \dot{J} \div$
30-3-2012 $\dot{o} \rightarrow \dot{o} \times$ $\dot{I} \dot{o} \dot{D}$ $\frac{3}{4} \dot{A} \dot{E} \dot{o} \div \ddot{A}$ $\dot{o} \dot{D} \frac{1}{4} \dot{A} \dot{E}$
 $\dot{I} \dot{o} \frac{3}{4} \ll \dot{E} \dot{d}$, $\pm \circ \dot{J} \div .19$ $\dot{I} \dot{o}$. $\dot{O} \dot{I}$ $\dot{J} \dot{I}$ $\dot{\Lambda} \frac{1}{2} \dot{C}$
 $\dot{I} \dot{o} \dot{D}$ $\dot{A} \dot{O} \dot{o}$ $\frac{3}{4} \dot{A} \dot{E} \dot{o} \dot{J} \dot{C} \dot{C} \dot{y}$ $\circ \dot{J} \div \dot{\Lambda} \dot{J}$ $\dot{\Lambda} \dot{i}$ $\dot{A} \dot{u} \div \frac{1}{2} \dot{o}$
 $\dot{O} \frac{3}{4} \dot{o}$ 4 $\frac{3}{4} \dot{A} \dot{E} \dot{o} \dot{J} \dot{C} \dot{C} \dot{u} \ll \dot{C} \dot{o} \frac{3}{4}$ $\dot{E} \frac{3}{4} \dot{I}$ $\dot{C} \dot{o} \frac{3}{4}$, \dot{C}
 $\dot{\Lambda} \dot{D}$ $\dot{S} \dot{A}$ \ddot{A} $\dot{I} \dot{o} \dot{A}$ $\circ \dot{A}$ $\frac{3}{4} \dot{A} \dot{E} \dot{o} \dot{J} \dot{C} \dot{C} \dot{u}$ $\dot{a} \dot{n}$ $\dot{E} \dot{A} \frac{3}{4} \dot{o}$
 $\dot{u} \dot{\Lambda} \dot{o} \frac{3}{4} \dot{I}$ $\ddot{E} \dot{o} \dot{A} \dot{D}$ $\pm \dot{y} \dot{U}$ $\pm \circ \dot{J} \div .20$ $\dot{E} \frac{3}{4} \dot{I}$ $\dot{C} \dot{o}$
 $\dot{I} \dot{E} \dot{o} \dot{\Lambda} \dot{O} \dot{I}$ $\dot{u} \dot{C} \dot{E}$. $\circ \dot{A}$ $\frac{3}{4} \dot{A} \dot{E} \dot{o} \dot{J} \dot{C} \dot{C} \dot{u}$ $\dot{\Lambda} \dot{D}$ $\dot{S} \dot{A}$ \ddot{A}
 $\dot{A} \dot{u} \dot{U} \dot{o}$ $\dot{o} \dot{D} \frac{1}{4} \dot{o} \frac{3}{4} \dot{u} \dot{i}$ \dot{o} $\dot{O} \dot{E} \dot{o} \dot{\Lambda} \dot{J} \dot{E}$ $\dot{A} \dot{o}$ $\dot{C} \dot{o}$ $\circ \dot{I}$ $\dot{\Lambda} \dot{O} \dot{I}$
 $\frac{3}{4} \dot{A} \dot{E} \dot{o} \div \dot{\Lambda} \dot{i} \dot{I}$ $p \dot{A} \dot{o} \dot{D}$ $\dot{u} \dot{\Lambda} \dot{i}$ $\dot{o} \frac{3}{4} \dot{C}$ $\dot{A} \dot{O} \dot{A} \frac{3}{4} \dot{J}$
 $\dot{I} \dot{E} \dot{o} \dot{\Lambda} \dot{O} \dot{I}$ 10-4-2012, 17-4-2012 $\dot{A} \dot{u} \dot{U} \dot{o}$ 26-4-2012
 $\rightarrow \dot{A} \dot{S} \frac{3}{4} \dot{C} \dot{o}$ $\dot{J} \dot{E} \dot{A} \dot{J}$ \dot{o} $\frac{3}{4} \dot{A} \dot{E} \dot{o} \dot{J} \div$ $\dot{I} \dot{o}$ $\frac{1}{2} \dot{A} \dot{O} \dot{i} \dot{I}$
 $\pm \dot{O} \frac{3}{4} \dot{A}$ $\dot{E} \frac{3}{4} \dot{I}$ \dot{u} $\pm \circ \dot{J} \div .21$ $\dot{O} \frac{3}{4} \dot{o}$ $\pm \circ \dot{J} \div .23$ $\dot{I} \dot{o}$.

51. 2-3-2012 0 0Ä | ¾jEÄjÇç ù ¾Ä Sçjì, 0
| ÁÐ ŠÄ¨ ÄÄ0 0Ä Äð¼Ð Ó¼0 15-5-2012
ñ j ½0ÄjÇ÷ ¨ Ç ÄÄðÊÄÐ Ä¨ Ä À0ŠÄÜ
0ð¼ÄŠÄj¾ | ¼ÄÈì ¨ Ç0 0Ä Äð¼ jÄ½ð¼Êj0
15-5-2012 Ó¼0 jÄÄ¨ ÄÄ¨ ÊÄç Êç ¾Ä¨ ¼ð0
| 0Ä0ŠÄjÄ¾j, | ÄÇÄ¼0Äð¼ çÄÄj, ð¼ç
« ÊÄ00 ±.0j.¬. 24 ¬ ì 0. « ¾ý | ¾j¼÷ì 0Äj,
| 0Ê0|Äñ ð SçjðÊŠ, ŠÄ¨ Ä çÜð¼0¼0
0Ä ¼j¾ | 0Ä | ¾jEÄjÇç Ùì | ÇÄ 0Äð¼ Ä½0
çf, ð¾Ä×, ÄÜ¾jÄ¨, ù 0ÄÄ0 « 0ÄÄ÷, Ùì |
« Ç0¾ Ê¾0 ¬, Ä¨ Ä, ù ±.0j.¬. 25 Ó¼0 ±.0j.¬. 34
Ä¨ Ä, ñ ÊÖì ç ÊÊ. ±¾ÄÜ¾jÄ¨ jÄ0Ð¨ ÊÄç
ÄjÐ, j0¨ Ä çjÊÄÐ ±.0j.¬. 34 Ó¼0 ±.0j.¬. 42 ¬ ì 0.

52. ÁŨ¼ĲĲ̄, ũ | ÁĐ ŠĀ̄. ÄĀø ®Î Äð¼¼Ĳø
 - ũÄð¼Ĳ Ĭ̄ - Ēø¼¼ü, ĲĒ - ¼ĲĲ̄ ũ ±, °Ĳ̄. - 43
 Ó¼ø 55 Ǟ. Ǟ|ÄĒ Ĭ̄Ēø¼¼øÄðĬ̄ ũĲĒ. ŠĀŨÄĒ
 - Ǟ½Ĳ̄, " Ç ŠĲĲ̄ Ĭ̄ ō ŠĲĐ ±¼ÄŨ̄¼Ĳ̄. ¼Äðð
 - Ǟ½Ĳ̄, Çø 15-5-2012ø, ¼Ǟ - ¼ðð | °öÄö
 ŠĲǞ¼Ĳ̄, ŨĒøÄĬ̄ ð̄, çÄĲ̄, ð¼ç « ĒÄöðĬ̄ ŲýĒ̄
 | ¼ĲĲ̄ÄĲ̄Çç Çø - ŲÄçÄĒÖĬ̄ Ĭ̄ ð̄, çÄĲ̄, ð¼çĬ̄ ð̄
 Þ̄ - ¼ŠĲ̄ Ĭ̄Ų̄, ÄĲĒ - Ē× ÞøÄĲ̄Äö ÞÖö¼Đ̄,
 ±ýǞ - ¼ Ĳ̄Ĳ̄ ÞĲ̄ Ĭ̄, ÄĒç, ŠĲñ Ĭ̄ ð̄.

63. |_{3/4j}._{3/4}.±ñ 32/2012ý ÁŨ_{3/4j}ÄÄjÉ ÄçfÄý
 À_{1/2c}|°öÄjÄø, ÄüE |_{3/4j}ÆÄjÇç ° Ç |ÄÐ SÄ° Ä
 |°öÄ à ñ ÈÖð, SÄÖð, Ä_{1/2c}|°öÖð |_{3/4j}ÆÄjÇç ° Ç,
 Ä_{1/2c}|°öÄ Ä_{4j}Äø ^{3/4I}ð^{3/4j}, ×ö « ^{3/4Ej}ø Ä°_j.- .16
 - ð^{3/4Ä}× ä Äö 12-2-2012ø Ä_{1/2c}ÄjüEð |°öÐ
 ÄÄjÄj⁶⁰ ÄçfÄø Ä_{1/2c}|°öÄ Ä_{1/2c}ð^{3/4j}, ñ Î üÇÐ.
 19-4-2012 S^{3/4j}Ä⁶⁰Ä_{1/4} ÄÇì ò S_jÖð, È^{3/4j} ° Ç
 Ä°_j.- . 47, Ä°_j.- . 50 ÄüÜö Ä°_j.- . 52 -, Ä
^{3/4j}Ä_{1/2c}S_jÖð « ÈÄ⁶⁰Çç ä Äö |_{3/4j}._{3/4}.±ñ 29/2012
 ÁŨ_{3/4j}Ä- þÄì, Äj, |_{3/4j}._{3/4}.±ñ 30/2012 ÁŨ_{3/4j}Ä-
 Äç ÄüÇç |_{3/4j}._{3/4}.±ñ 32/2012 ÁŨ_{3/4j}Ä- ÄçfÄý
 -, SÄj_jÜì « ÜðÄðÄð^{3/4j}, ñ ÈÖì, ÈÐ.
 « ÄüÈø þðÁŨ_{3/4j}Ä- ü SÄ° Ä S_jÄð^{3/4c} Ä_{1/2c}|°öÄ
 |°öÄjÄø S_jÄð° ^{3/4}Ä_{1/2c}ÈðÐð ÄüÜö Ä_{1/2c}|°öÖð
 Ä_{1/2c}ÄjÇç, ° Çö Ä_{1/2c}|°öÄÄ_{4j}Äø ^{3/4I}ðÐ - üÄð^{3/4c}
 Î - È×ì Î ^{3/4j}Ä_{1/2c}Äj, þÖðÐ ÄÖÄ^{3/4j}ø ^{2y}- í, ü
 ÄÐ - Øí Î ^{3/4j}ÄÄè, ±ì ì, ü_{1/4j}Ð ±È
 S_jÄðÄðÎ üÇÐ. þö^{3/4} S_jðÈ° ° ^{3/4ÄÄ}
 þðÁŨ_{3/4j}Ä- ü ÄÐ Î üÈì°_jðÎ - ° ^{1/2}Ä° ÈÄö
 Ä_{1/4c}Ä° Ä. SÄÖð, - üÐ° È ÄçfÄ- ^{1/2} ^{3/4c}ð^{3/4c}Ä_{1/4}×ö
 þø° Ä. Ö |_{3/4j}ÆÄjÇç Äö Ä_{1/2c} ^{3/4j}ö |°öÄ

Bharat Iron Works - Vs. - Bhagubhai Balubhai Patel and Ors. (1976) 1SCC518.

Labour and Industrial - jurisdictional error - sections 10 and 33 of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 - respondents were charged by management - charges denied as false - victimization pleaded by respondents on account of trade activity - order of dismissal passed - management made application under section 33 - Tribunal after recording evidences from both sides refused to grant approval holding view that there was no *prima facie* case - Tribunal had no jurisdiction to act as court of appeal - jurisdictional error made by Tribunal - Tribunal directed to record appropriate orders and application under section 33 to be approved.

Rajasthan State Road Transport Corporation and Anr. - Vs. - Satya Prakash, 2013(6) SCALE654.

... It could not have passed the order of reinstatement with continuity in service in favour of the respondent on the basis that initially the Appellant had committed a breach of section 33(2)(b) of the Act. It is true that the Appellant had not applied for the necessary approval as required under that section. That is why the complaint was filed by the respondent under section 33A of the Act. That complaint having been filed, it was adjudicated like a reference as required by the statute. The same having been done, and the misconduct having been held to have been proved, now, there is no question to hold that the termination shall still continue to be void and inoperative...

67. - Á½í, " Ç - öó¾¾ 27-2-2012 « ý Ú ÁÍ ö¾ÁÍ S¾ÁÇ « Ç¾¾ ±. °. - .7 |¾íÆ¾¾¾ ÁÍ ð. íÁí. ²üÜ « ý SÈ °Á° « ¾Ç ííÆ¾¾ ÁÇ íÁ" ½ |°ÖÐ, °Á° ÖÈÇ « ÈÄÇ, ðÄðÍ, |¾íÆ¾¾, ðÄð¾¾¾, |¾í.¾í. ±ñ 2766/2011° °Á° ÖÈÇ « ÈÄ" , ÁÇ Ì ÈÇÄÇðÄðÍ ùÇÐ. |¾í.¾í. ÁÇÇ 12(6)ý, ñ Á" ÁÁ" È |°ÖÄðÄðÍ ùÇÐ.

The Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 Duties of Conciliation Officers S.12(6)

... 12(6) A report under this section shall be submitted within fourteen days of the commencement of the conciliation proceedings or within such shorter period as may be fixed by the appropriate Government.

68. SÁÜÄÈ ÁÇÇ 12(6), ñ « ÁÍ 14 Çíð, ÙíÌ ù « ÈÄ" , Á ÞóÇ¾¾ýÈð¾¾ « ÇÄ, ÁÇ" Á. ±. °. - .7 ÁÜÈÄ « ÈÄ" , Á Á½Ç Çí, ð |°Ö¾ S¾¾¾¾É 22-5-2012íÌ Óýð ÞóÇ¾¾ýÈð¾¾Í « Ç¾¾¾¾¾ 33(2)(b)ý ÄÈíÌ Á½Ç Çí, ð |°ÖÄíÐ ±ýÚð « ðÄ ÁÇ ÁÜ" Á ¾íí, Ç |°ÖÄí¾¾¾

« ðÄ½Ç Çí, ð ²ü, ð¾í, ¾ÖÄ ±ýÚ ÙÚð ÁÜ¾í: ¾Äð ÙüÜ ÞüÄÇ, Äð¾¾ ²ü, ð¾í, ¾í, « ÈÄ ÖÈÄÇ" Á. ±. °. - .7 ¾ÄÄ SÁÖð 18-6-2012 « ý Ú ÁÜ¾í: ù ¾ÄðÄÇ « ÇÄ, ðÄð¾ ±. °. - .28 ÁÜÜð 28-6-2012 « ý Ú ÁÜ¾í: ù ¾Äðð |¾íÆ¾¾ÇÇ ù « Ç¾¾ ±. °. - .32ý ð ííý SÁíÇ SÁÖð ÞÖ ¾íÁí ù |¾íÆ¾¾ÇÇ « ÖÄÄ, ÇÇð |¾í¾Äð¾¾¾, ×ð ÁÜ¾í: ù ¾ÄðÄÇ ±Í ðÐ" Áí, ðÄð¾Ð. - ÉíÇ Þó¾ ÞÖ ¾íÁí, Ùð Á. °. 1 Á½Ç Çí, ð - ð¾Ä × ²üÄð¾¾ ¾ÈÄÉ 22-5-2012 íÌ ÁÇ É: ²üÄð¾¾" Á, ÇíÌ ð. - , SÁ, 33(2)(b)ý, ñ ÞðÄ½Ç Çí, ð |°ÖÄíÐ ±ýÈ Áí¾ð ²ü, ð¾í, ¾ÖÄ ±ýÚ Çíý ÖÈÇ |°Ö, SÈý.

69. SÁÜÄÈ, Óý¾ððí " Ç SÇíí ð SÁíÐ ÇÈÄí, ð¾¾ Á½Ç ðíÖð |¾íÆ¾¾ÇÇ ù, ÇÈÄí, ð¾ÈÖíÌ Þ" ½Äí, ÇýÚ °íÇÇÇ: °ÁÁí, SÁÍ ð ÇÇ ÁÄÇ ÞÇ" Á ±ýÚð ÇÈÄí, ð¾È" Á ÁÇ |¾íÆ¾¾ÇÇ ù ÁÄÄÈ ÁÇÇ Á °í: ð¾Ä: ù ±ýÚð, « ¾ÈíÇ |¾íÆ¾¾ÇÇ: ÇÄíð¾í, ÇÇ ÁÄý, ù ÁÄÄÈ ÁÇÇÈÖíÌ SÁíÇ S°Á SÁñ Í ð ±È, Ö¾ÖÈ, ÈÐ. ÞðÁÜ¾í: " Ç Á½Ç Çí, ð |°ÖÄ¾íÌ Óý SÁí¾Ä Áíðð « ÇÄ, íÁÇ Á½Ç Çí, ð |°ÖÄðÄðÍ ùÇ¾í, ×ð |¾íÆ¾¾ÇÇ, ÈÐ. Þð¾í ÝúÇÇ ÁÄÇ, ÁÜ¾í: ÙíÌ ±¾ÄÁÜ¾í: - ¾SÈ Á½Ç ÁÇÇÁÇ ÄÄí" È Þðð¾¾í, Çíý « ÈÄÇ" Á. - ÉíÇ, ÁÈí " °í ¾Ç " ÇÖð ÝúÇÇ Á, " ÇÖð, SÇíí ð SÁíÐ Á½Ç ð |¾í¾í: °Ç « ÇÄ, Áíð ±ýÚð ÁÇ " °ÄÇð 50% ÁðÍ SÁ ÁÜ¾í: ù |ÄÈ - íÆÄ: ù ±È - ð¾ÄÄÇÄíð ±È ×ð Çíý, ÖÐ, SÈý. ÁÜ " í ¾Ç " Ç SÇíí ð SÁíÐ, ÁÜÄÇ S, ííÖùÇ ÁÜÈ ÁíÇÁí, " Çð |ÁíÜðÐ ÁÜ ²ü, ð¾í, ¾ÖÄ ±È Çíý, ÖÐ, SÈý.

ÖÈÄÇ, ÞðÁÜ Äí ¾Äí, « ÙÁ¾ð, ðÄí, ÈÐ. ±¾ÈÁÜ¾í: ÇÈÄí, ð, ÁÜ¾í: ÙíÌ Áñ Í ð Á½Ç ÁÇÇ, SÁñ Í ð ±È - ð¾ÄÄÇÄí, ÈÐ. Á½Ç ð |¾í¾í: °Ç ÁÜÜð Þ¾Ä " Ö" , " Ç ÁÜ¾í: ù |ÄÈ - íÇ ÁÖ" ¾ÄÄ: ù ±ýÚð - ÉíÇ 50% ÁÇ " °ÄÇð ÁðÍ SÁ ÁÜ¾í: ù |ÄÈ - íÇ ÁÖùÇÄ: ù ±È ×ð, Þ¾ÈíÇ - ð¾ÄÄÇÄí, ÈÐ. |°Ä ×ð |¾í" , ÞÇ" Á.

±ýÈíÇ |°ÖÄðÄðÍ, ¾ð¾í °ÁíÇ ¾ð¾íÍ |°ÖÄðÄðÍ, 2013 - ð ñ Í íý Áí¾ð 27ð Çíù « " ÁÄÈÄ Á, ÄðÄð¾Ð.

D. SÁí. ý¾íS,
¾" Á" Á¾íÍ Ì ð « ÖÄÄ:
|¾íÆ¾¾ÇÇ: Ç¾ÄýÈð

|¾íÆ¾¾¾, ÁíÜ ±ñ 29/2012

ÁÇííÇ, ðÄð¾ " °íðÇÇÇ ÄðÈÄÇ.

ÁÜ¾í: ¾ÄðÄÇ:

Á. °. 1.- I. ÞÄí, Äí

Á. °. 2.- E. Í ó¾ÄÄ ð¾Ç (|¾íÆ¾¾í, ð¾Ç |°ÄÄ:).

±¾ ÅÛ¼;Ã: ¼ÃðÀø :

±.Á.º.1 - P. òì¼\$Åø

±.Á.º.2 - M. À;Ã;fç

±.Á.º.3 - S. , Õ%½ý

±.Á.º.4 - L. Í,ý Â;

±.Á.º.5 - P. - ñ ¼;û

|¼;Æü¼,Ã;Û ±ñ 30/2012

Å;¼;¼,ðÀð¼ ò;ð°ç Çç ÀðÊÂø.

ÅÛ¼;Ã: ¼ÃðÀø :

Á.º.1.- V. ÅÛç

Á.º.2.- E. Í ó¼Ãã ÷ð¼ç (|¼;Æüº.1, ð¼ç |°ÂÃ÷).

±¾ ÅÛ¼;Ã: ¼ÃðÀø :

±.Á.º.1 - P. òì¼\$Åø

±.Á.º.2 - M. À;Ã;fç

±.Á.º.3 - S. , Õ%½ý

±.Á.º.4 - L. Í,ý Â;

±.Á.º.5 - P. - ñ ¼;û

|¼;Æü¼,Ã;Û ±ñ 31/2012

Å;¼;¼,ðÀð¼ ò;ð°ç Çç ÀðÊÂø.

ÅÛ¼;Ã: ¼ÃðÀø :

Á.º.1.- S. ç¼Ã;

Á.º.2.- E. Í ó¼Ãã ÷ð¼ç (|¼;Æüº.1, ð¼ç |°ÂÃ÷).

±¾ ÅÛ¼;Ã: ¼ÃðÀø :

±.Á.º.1 - P. òì¼\$Åø

±.Á.º.2 - M. À;Ã;fç

±.Á.º.3 - S. , Õ%½ý

±.Á.º.4 - L. Í,ý Â;

±.Á.º.5 - P. - ñ ¼;û

|¼;Æü¼,Ã;Û ±ñ 32/2012

Å;¼;¼,ðÀð¼ ò;ð°ç Çç ÀðÊÂø.

ÅÛ¼;Ã: ¼ÃðÀø :

Á.º.1.- A. ÅçÃý

Á.º.2.- E. Í ó¼Ãã ÷ð¼ç (|¼;Æüº.1, ð¼ç |°ÂÃ÷).

±¾ ÅÛ¼;Ã: ¼ÃðÀø :

±.Á.º.1 - P. òì¼\$Åø

±.Á.º.2 - M. À;Ã;fç

±.Á.º.3 - S. , Õ%½ý

±.Á.º.4 - L. Í,ý Â;

±.Á.º.5 - P. - ñ ¼;û

|¼;Æü¼,Ã;Û ±ñ 33/2012

Å;¼;¼,ðÀð¼ ò;ð°ç Çç ÀðÊÂø.

ÅÛ¼;Ã: ¼ÃðÀø :

Á.º.1.- S. ÅÉf;

Á.º.2.- E. Í ó¼Ãã ÷ð¼ç (|¼;Æüº.1, ð¼ç |°ÂÃ÷).

±¾ ÅÛ¼;Ã: ¼ÃðÀø :

±.Á.º.1 - P. òì¼\$Åø

±.Á.º.2 - M. À;Ã;fç

±.Á.º.3 - S. , Õ%½ý

±.Á.º.4 - L. Í,ý Â;

±.Á.º.5 - P. - ñ ¼;û

|¼;Æü¼,Ã;Û ±ñ 29/2012,

|¼;Æü¼,Ã;Û ±ñ 30/2012,

|¼;Æü¼,Ã;Û ±ñ 31/2012,

|¼;Æü¼,Ã;Û ±ñ 32/2012,

|¼;Æü¼,Ã;Û ±ñ 33/2012-ø

|À;ðÁ; , Ì Ê¼ðÀð¼ - Å½ í, Çç ÀðÊÂø

ÅÛ¼;Ã: ¼ÃðÀø :

±ñ	§¼ç	- Å½ ÅÃ
Á.º.- .1	22-5-2012	Copy of the dismissal order issued by the respondent to the petitioner.
Á.º.- .2	22-5-2012	Copy of the demand draft issued by the respondent to the petitioner.
Á.º.- .3	18-6-2012	Copy of the petition submitted by the petitioner before the Labour Officer (Conciliation).
Á.º.- .4	5-7-2012	Copy of the enquiry call letter sends by the Labour Officer (Conciliation), Puducherry to the petitioner.
Á.º.- .5	2-3-2012	Copy of the trade union registration certificate.
Á.º.- .6	21-11-2011	Copy of the charter of demands given to the Labour Officer by the plaintiff.
Á.º.- .7	15-5-2012	Copy of respondent management lock-out notice.
Á.º.- .8	15-5-2012	Copy of the complaint under section 25T, 25U and 26(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, before the Labour Officer (Conciliation), Puducherry.

Á.ºj.-.9	15-5-2012	Copy of the enquiry/conciliation call letter sends by the Labour Officer, Conciliation, Puducherry.	Á.ºj.-.33	5-3-2012	Copy of S. Shanthi suspend order.
Á.ºj.-.10	24-1-2012	Copy of Gomathy dismissal order.	Á.ºj.-.34	5-3-2012	Copy of Manjula suspend order.
Á.ºj.-.11	24-1-2012	Copy of Suganthi dismissal order.	Á.ºj.-.35	5-3-2012	Copy of B. Shanthi suspend order.
Á.ºj.-.12	13-2-2012	Copy of Neelavathy dismissal order.	Á.ºj.-.36	5-3-2012	Copy of Sathyavani suspend order.
Á.ºj.-.13	18-2-2012	Copy of Vasunthradevi transfer order.	Á.ºj.-.37	10-11-2011	Copy of respondent Management Letter.
Á.ºj.-.14	12-3-2012	Copy of Prakash Department transfer order.	Á.ºj.-.38	29-12-2011	Copy of Enquiry/Conciliation call letter ID. No. 2766/2011 sent by the Labour Officer (Conciliation), Puducherry.
Á.ºj.-.15	12-3-2012	Copy of Anbazhagan Department transfer order.	Á.ºj.-.39	19-4-2012	Copy of Nagappan show cause notice.
Á.ºj.-.16	12-3-2012	Copy of Vijayan Department transfer order.	Á.ºj.-.40	19-4-2012	Copy of Radha show cause notice.
Á.ºj.-.17	12-03-2012	Copy of Paranthaman Department transfer order.	Á.ºj.-.41	19-4-2012	Copy of Venkatesan show cause notice.
Á.ºj.-.18	14-3-2012	Copy of Sundaramoorthy, Department transfer order.	Á.ºj.-.42	19-4-2012	Copy of Rejina show cause notice.
Á.ºj.-.19	14-3-2012	Copy of Venkatesan Department transfer order.	Á.ºj.-.43	19-4-2012	Copy of Deepa show cause notice.
Á.ºj.-.20	14-03-2012	Copy of Thamee Ahamed Department transfer order.	Á.ºj.-.44	19-4-2012	Copy of Chandraprakash show cause notice.
Á.ºj.-.21	14-3-2012	Copy of Chandrasekar Department transfer order.	Á.ºj.-.45	19-4-2012	Copy of Anbazhagan show cause notice.
Á.ºj.-.22	19-3-2012	Copy of Prakash Department transfer order.	Á.ºj.-.46	19-4-2012	Copy of Prakash show cause notice.
Á.ºj.-.23	19-3-2012	Copy of Anbazhagan Department transfer order.	Á.ºj.-.47	19-4-2012	Copy of Ilakiya show cause notice.
Á.ºj.-.24	19-3-2012	Copy of Vijayan Department transfer order.	Á.ºj.-.48	19-4-2012	Copy of Pachaiammal show cause notice.
Á.ºj.-.25	19-3-2012	Copy of Paranthaman Department transfer order.	Á.ºj.-.49	19-4-2012	Copy of Sundaramoorthy show cause notice.
Á.ºj.-.26	19-3-2012	Copy of Sundaramoorthy Department transfer order.	Á.ºj.-.50	19-4-2012	Copy of Vally show cause notice.
Á.ºj.-.27	19-3-2012	Copy of Venkatesan Department transfer order.	Á.ºj.-.51	19-4-2012	Copy of Chandrasekar show cause notice.
Á.ºj.-.28	19-3-2012	Copy of Thamees Ahamed Department transfer order.	Á.ºj.-.52	19-4-2012	Copy of Vijayan show cause notice.
Á.ºj.-.29	19-3-2012	Copy of Chandrasekar Department transfer order.	Á.ºj.-.53	19-04-2012	Copy of Thamees Ahamed show cause notice.
Á.ºj.-.30	5-3-2012	Copy of Navaneethammal suspend order.	Á.ºj.-.54	3-3-2012	Copy of First Information Report, FIR No. 45/12 by SHO, Mettupalayam.
Á.ºj.-.31	5-3-2012	Copy of Sarasu suspend order.	Á.ºj.-.55	—	Copy of salary bills of all employees for the month of March.
Á.ºj.-.32	5-3-2012	Copy of Easwari suspend order.			

Á.ºj.¬ .56	14-7-2012	Copy of Navaneethammal dismissal order.	±¼¢ ÁÛ¼jÃ± ¼ÃôÃø:		
Á.ºj.¬ .57	14-7-2012	Copy of Manjula dismissal order.	±ñ	§¼¼¢	¬ Á½ ÅÃÃø
Á.ºj.¬ .58	14-7-2012	Copy of Sathiyavani dismissal order.	±.ºj.¬ .1	5-3-2013	Copy of the authorisation letter by respondent.
Á.ºj.¬ .59	14-7-2012	Copy of B. Shanthi dismissal order.	±.ºj.¬ .2	11-10-2011	Copy of the letter by respondent to Labour Officer (Conciliation).
Á.ºj.¬ .60	14-7-2012	Copy of S. Shanthi dismissal order.	±.ºj.¬ .3	10-11-2011	Copy of the Proceedings before Labour Officer (Conciliation) in I.D. No. 1762/2011.
Á.ºj.¬ .61	14-7-2012	Copy of Sarasu dismissal order.	±.ºj.¬ .4	29-11-2011	Copy of the reply by respondent to Payment of Wages Authority.
Á.ºj.¬ .62	14-7-2012	Copy of Easwari dismissal order.	±.ºj.¬ .5	17-2-2012	Copy of the complaint by Vasunthradevi to Labour Welfare Officer.
Á.ºj.¬ .63	15-3-2012	Copy of the Letter No.Py-2127/CIF2B/A2/2012, issued by the Inspector of Factories to the respondent.	±.ºj.¬ .6	18-2-2012	Copy of the transfer order by respondent to Vasunthradevi.
Á.ºj.¬ .64	19-3-2012	Copy of the show cause notice issued by the Inspector of Factories to the respondent.	±.ºj.¬ .7	27-2-2012	Copy of the complaint by Vasunthradevi to Labour Officer (Conciliation).
Á.ºj.¬ .65	6-6-2012	Copy of letter issued by the Inspector of Factories to the petitioner's union.	±.ºj.¬ .8	—	Copy of the Proceedings in No. 2766/LO(C)AIL/2011.
Á.ºj.¬ .66	11-11-2011	Copy of the order passed by the authority under Payment of Wages Act, 1936.	±.ºj.¬ .9	3-3-2012	Copy of the complaint letters (7 Nos.) by non-striking worker to respondent.
Á.ºj.¬ .67	17-10-2011	Copy of the complaint letter submitted before the authority under the Payment of Wages Act, 1936 by the petitioner's union.	±.ºj.¬ .10	3-3-2012	Copy of the respondent's notice affixed on notice-board.
Á.ºj.¬ .68	29-9-2011	Copy of complaint letter submitted before the E.S.I. office by the petitioner union.	±.ºj.¬ .11	3-3-2012	Copy of the complaint by Mrs. Andal and FIR in Cr. No. 45/12.
Á.ºj.¬ .69	28-9-2011	Copy of complaint letter given by submitted before the Inspector of Factories by the petitioner's union.	±.ºj.¬ .12	5-3-2012	Copy of the respondent's notice affixed on notice-board.
Á.ºj.¬ .70	26-12-2011	Copy of the letter submitted by the respondent before the Labour Officer, Conciliation.	±.ºj.¬ .13	7-3-2012	Copy of the respondent's notice affixed on notice board.
Á.ºj.¬ .71	21-11-2011	Copy of the letter submitted by the respondent before the Labour Officer, Conciliation.	±.ºj.¬ .14	14-3-2012	Copy of the letter of the Production Supervisor to respondent to Personnel Manager.
Á.ºj.¬ .72	19-5-2012	Copy of the letter pasted by the respondent.	±.ºj.¬ .15	14-3-2012	Copy of the letter by respondent to the Labour Commissioner.
Á.ºj.¬ .73	23-6-2012	Copy of the letter pasted by the respondent.	±.ºj.¬ .16	13-3-2012	Copy of the transfer orders issued by respondent to 7 workers.
Á.ºj.¬ .74	27-5-2013	Copy of the letter pasted by the respondent.	±.ºj.¬ .17	19-3-2012	Copy of the retransfer orders issued by respondent to said 7 workers.

±.°j.¬ .18	27-3-2012	Copy of the visit note of the Social Security Officer.	±.°j.¬ .36	17-5-2012	Copy of the letter requesting police protection by the respondent.
±.°j.¬ .19	30-3-2012	Copy of the reply by respondent to Chief Inspector of Factories.	±.°j.¬ .37	—	Copy of the affidavit and petition in WP. 13736/2012 filed by respondent.
±.°j.¬ .20	9-4-2012	Copy of the letters (4 Nos.) by non-striking workers to respondent.	±.°j.¬ .38	23-5-2012	Copy of the order MP. 1/2012 in WP. 13736/2012.
±.°j.¬ .21	10-4-2012	Copy of the letter by respondent to Labour Commissioner.	±.°j.¬ .39	25-5-2012	Copy of the letter requesting police protection by the respondents.
±.°j.¬ .22	17-4-2012	Copy of the letter by respondent to Labour Commissioner.	±.°j.¬ .40	May 2012	Copy of the photographs depicting police protection to respondent company.
±.°j.¬ .23	26-4-2012	Copy of the letter by respondent to Labour Commissioner.	±.°j.¬ .41	31-5-2012	Copy of the notice enclosing affidavit and petition in WP. 14223/2012 dated 28-05-2012 filed by non-striking workers of the respondent company.
±.°j.¬ .24	15-5-2012	Copy of the lock-out notice by respondent.	±.°j.¬ .42	23-6-2012	Copy of the Order Mp. 1/2012 in WP.13736/2012.
±.°j.¬ .25	19-5-2012	Copy of the settlement offer notice by respondent.	±.°j.¬ .43	14-12-2011	Process monitoring record
±.°j.¬ .26	22-5-2012	Copy of the representation by non-striking workers to the Labour Officer (Conciliation), Labour Commissioner, Payment of Wages Authority, Inspector of Factories.	±.°j.¬ .44	6-1-2012	Process monitoring record
±.°j.¬ .27	17-4-2012	Copy of the termination letter by respondent to petitioners.	±.°j.¬ .45	22-2-2012	Process monitoring record
±.°j.¬ .28	18-6-2012	Copy of the representation letter by petitioners to Labour Officer (Conciliation).	±.°j.¬ .46	12-12-2011 to 17-12-2011 2-1-2012 to 7-1-2012 & 20-2-2012 to 26-2-2012	Shift schedule
±.°j.¬ .29	—	Copy of the Proceedings in No. 1652 to 1656/LOC/AIL2012.	±.°j.¬ .47	14-12-2011, 6-1-2012 & 22-2-2012	Shift-wise production -cum- target sheet.
±.°j.¬ .30	—	Copy of the Proceedings in ID. No.1367/2012.	±.°j.¬ .48	4-1-2012, 6-2-2012 & 2-3-2012	During wilful go-slow illegal strike by petitioners and striking workers.
±.°j.¬ .31	23-6-2012	Copy of the notice by respondent to striking workers.	±.°j.¬ .49	2-4-2012	Monthly production details for December 2011, January 2012 and February 2012.
±.°j.¬ .32	28-6-2012	Copy of the representation by 30 striking workers to the Labour Officer (Conciliation).			Monthly production details for March 2012.
±.°j.¬ .33	—	Copy of the proceedings in No. 1817LO(C)/AIL/2012.			During wilful go-slow illegal strike by petitioners and striking workers.
±.°j.¬ .34	5-7-2012	Copy of the reply given to representation dated 18-6-2012.			
±.°j.¬ .35	3-3-2012	Copy of the police complaint by respondent seeking police protection.			

±.°j.¬ .50	5-3-2012 to 10-3-2012 and 19-3-2012 to 24-3-2012	Shift schedule During wilful go-slow illegal strike by petitioners and striking workers.
±.°j.¬ .51	5-3-2012	Process monitoring record and shift-wise production-cum- target sheet. During wilful go-slow illegal strike by petitioners and striking workers.
±.°j.¬ .52	20-3-2012	Process monitoring record and shiftwise production-cum- target sheet. During wilful go-slow illegal strike by petitioners and striking workers.
±.°j.¬ .53	—	Stage-wise time study report December 2011, January 2012 and February 2012. During wilful go-slow illegal strike by petitioners and striking workers.
±.°j.¬ .54	—	Stage-wise time study report March 2012. During wilful go-slow illegal strike by petitioners and striking workers.
±.°j.¬ .55	14-12-2011, 6-1-2012, 22-2-2012, 5-3-2012 and 20-3-2012	Comparative study chart of the first stage of production (Rubberise Main)

Đ. ŠÁĭ.Ÿ¼ĭŠ,
¾" Ä" Á ¾ĭĭ Ĩ õ « ÖÄÄ÷,
ĭ ¾ĭÄĖĖÇ÷ ĭ ¾ĖŸ Ėõ, òĐĭŠ°ĭç

**GOVERNMENT OF PUDUCHERRY
LABOUR DEPARTMENT**

(G.O. Rt. No. 164/Lab./AIL/J/2013, dated 7th November 2013)

NOTIFICATION

Whereas, an award in I.D. No. 3/2011, dated 15-5-2013 of the Labour Court, Puducherry in respect of the industrial dispute between the Managing Director, M/s. Hindustan Unilever Ltd. Tea Factory, Puducherry and its workman Thiru S. Raja, over non-employment has been received;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act XIV of 1947) read with the notification issued in Labour Department's G.O. Ms. No. 20/91/Lab./L, dated 23-5-1991, it is hereby directed by Secretary to Government (Labour) that the said award shall be published in the official Gazette, Puducherry.

(By order)

S. THAMMU GANAPATHY,
Under Secretary to Government (Labour).

BEFORE THE LABOUR COURT AT PUDUCHERRY

Present : Thiru T. MOHANDASS, M.A., M.L.,
Presiding Officer, Labour Court.

Wednesday, the 15th day of May 2013

I.D. No. 3/2011

S. Raja, S/o. Soundararajan,
Sarkaasimedu, Bahour Commune,
Puducherry. . . Petitioner

Vs.

Hindustan Unilever Ltd. Tea Factory,
Rep. by its Factory Manager,
Kirumampakkam, Puducherry. . . Respondent

This industrial dispute coming on 29-4-2013 for final hearing before me in the presence of Thiru P.R. Thiruneelakandan and Mithun, Advocates for the petitioner, Tvl. L. Sathish, N. Krishnamurthy, T. Pravin and V. Veeraragavan, Advocates for the respondent, upon hearing both sides, upon perusing the case records, after having stood over for consideration till this day, this court passed the following:

AWARD

This industrial dispute arises out of the reference made by the Government of Puducherry, *vide* G.O. Rt. No. 28/AIL/Lab./J/2011, dated 7-2-2011 of the Labour Department, Puducherry to resolve the following dispute between the petitioner and the respondent, *viz.*,

(1) Whether the dispute raised by Thiru S. Raja, against the management of M/s. Hindustan Unilever Limited Tea Factory, Puducherry, over non-employment is justified or not?

(2) If justified, to what relief the petitioner is entitled to?

(3) To compute the relief, if any, awarded in terms of money, if it can be so computed?

2. The petitioner, in his claim statement, has averred as follows:

The petitioner was a Secretary of Hindustan Lever Limited Tea Workers' Welfare Union. He was informed to attend the meeting on 29-7-2009 as a representative of the trade union by the respondent management through a worker. After getting proper permission, the petitioner went inside the company and went along with H.R. Officer to the said meeting spot. In the said meeting, the T.P.M. Officer Mr. Sundaram compelled all the workers to increase the Hassia machine production and threatened them that otherwise the workers engaged in the said machine will be terminated. The threatened speech of the said officer created chaos among the workers, who attended the meeting. The petitioner as a Secretary to the trade union, intervened and told the workers to resume their work and he requested the said T.P.M. Officer to discuss all the issues with the union. The workers resumed their work and the meeting was cancelled and the petitioner also left the factory. On 3-8-2009 the respondent issued enquiry notice and the charge memo with false allegations. There is a violation in issuing the charge sheet and appointing the Enquiry Officer. The enquiry conducted by the Enquiry Officer was not proper and as against the principles of natural justice. The Enquiry Officer submitted his report according to the wishes of the respondent, without conducting fair and proper enquiry and acted in biased manner against the petitioner. The major punishment of termination was imposed by the respondent without proper consideration of petitioner's written explanation. The termination of petitioner service is highly disproportionate to the charges levelled against him. The petitioner was victimised for his trade union activities and is terminated from service on false allegation. The termination of the petitioner is an unfair labour practice on the part of the respondent. The termination of the petitioner is illegal and against the provision of the model standing order and against the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act.

3. In the counter statement, the respondent has stated as follows:

The petitioner was a confirmed employee. He always exhibited his aggressive, subversive and temperamental character and would pick up unnecessary quarrels and duels with his shift supervisors, plant in-charge and other officers of the company and the respondent had warned and punished the petitioner on number of occasions.

On 29-7-2009 at about 1.00 p.m. when the petitioner was not on duty, he came to the factory on his own accord to meet the H.R. Executive. He was permitted to meet the H.R. Executive only and

that too in her cabin. While sitting in the cabin, he suddenly left the cabin and barged into the shop floor in utter disregard to the instructions of H.R. Executives to refrain from doing so. In the shop floor, the Production Manager and the other executives were having discussions with the operators of Hassia machine regarding its productivity. The petitioner disrupted the meeting, started using abusive language against the executives and the manager, misbehaved with them and chided the executive by name Sundaram by using filthy language. The petitioner intimidated the said Sundaram by holding him by his shift collar and created an atmosphere of panic and pandemonium. The petitioner disturbed the normal operations of the factory. He was never invited by the management for any discussions as there was no formal meeting with the workers and it was only a discussion with the group of workers working on the machine. The executives immediately lodged a complaint against the petitioner and therefore the petitioner was issued an order of suspension pending enquiry on 29-7-2009.

The petitioner was issued a detailed charge sheet on 3-8-2009 and an independent Enquiry Officer was appointed by the respondent on 5-8-2009 and his misconduct was proved in the enquiry. Since the misconduct committed by the petitioner was grave in nature, the respondent had imposed the maximum punishment of dismissal and the petitioner was dismissed on 22-6-2010. Hence, they pray for dismissal of the industrial dispute.

4. In the re-joinder statement, the petitioner has stated as follows:

The domestic enquiry was not fair and proper and tried to give instances as to how the enquiry was not fair in his opinion. Further the charge sheet was served with enquiry notice and he was not called upon to give any explanation to the charges. He was denied the opportunity to reply to the charge sheet, which is in violation of clause 39(c) of certified standing orders of the company. The petitioner denied his involvement in the past misconducts.

5. In the reply statement, the respondent has stated as follows:

The petitioner was given a specific charge sheet dated 28-11-2001 and domestic enquiry was conducted. After enquiry, the petitioner pleaded guilty and hence with a view to give him one more opportunity, the warning letter dated 19-11-2004 was served, which was received by the petitioner in person. Hence, the petitioner's claim that no enquiry was conducted, no opportunity was given to present his stand is false.

6. On the side of the petitioner, PW.1 was examined and Ex.P1 to Ex.P8 were marked. On the side of the respondent, RW.1 was examined and Ex.R1 to Ex.R17 were marked.

7. *The point for determination is:*

Whether the petitioner can be considered for reinstatement in service with accrued benefits?

8. *On the point :*

It is submitted that petitioner herein filed an application I.A. 148/2012 for summoning 7 witnesses to prove his innocence regarding the charges proved in domestic enquiry. Those 7 witnesses were already examined in the enquiry proceedings. The respondent therefore filed I.A. 4/2013 for deciding the fairness of domestic enquiry on the premise that if the domestic enquiry is found to be fair, just and proper, there is no scope of recording further evidence regarding guilt of petitioner. Accordingly, this court took up both the applications together and allowed I.A. No. 4/2013 filed by respondent, holding that the enquiry held by respondent is just, fair and proper and need no further intervention. Simultaneously, this court has dismissed I.A. No. 148/2012 filed by petitioner for summoning witnesses. The orders passed in both the applications have attained finality. Thus this court has held that the domestic enquiry against the petitioner is fair, just and proper and needs no intervention and the same has attained its finality.

9. The learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that issuing charge sheet along with enquiry notice, without giving an opportunity to petitioner to reply to charge sheet is in violation of certified standing orders of company and hence the entire enquiry stands vitiated. He further submitted that if the charge sheet was given to the petitioner and issued a show cause notice before commencing the domestic enquiry, the petitioner would have given effective representation and explanation to the respondent and also he would have addressed the resident's *mala fide* intention, victimisation and unfair labour practice to his trade union and in turn the trade union would have raised the industrial dispute about the victimisation, unfair labour practice of the respondent management against the petitioner. Further he submitted that the findings of Enquiry Officer regarding the guilt of petitioner on the misconduct alleged is not proper as there is no sufficient proof for the petitioner having committed the misconduct. In order to support his claim, he relied upon the following decisions:

AIR 2001 SC 343, reported in 2010 (3) LLN.693:

State of Punjab Vs. V.K. Khanna:

"It is well settled in service jurisprudence that the concerned authority has to apply his mind upon receipt of the reply to the charge sheet or show cause

as the case may be, as to whether a further enquiry is called for. In the event, upon deliberations and due considerations, it is in the affirmative the enquiry follows but no otherwise. On facts, the Supreme Court held that the appointment of an Enquiry Officer even before submission of the reply of the delinquent employee to indicated the mindset of the authority that the enquiry should proceed irrespective of his reply, demonstrating that the attitude of the authority towards the delinquent was not free and fair.

2005(3) L.L.N. 187:

Ch. Appala Reddy Vs. Eastern Power Distribution Company of Andhra Pradesh Ltd.:

"The employee challenged the charges framed against him by the Enquiry Officer on the ground that the same was not preceded by a show cause notice. This court held that the appointing authority would be in a position to apply its mind only when it calls upon the employee to explain as to the acts misconduct levelled against him and depending upon the satisfaction of the appointing authority on consideration of such explanation, the necessity to proceed further by way of an enquiry or drop further proceedings would arise. As the employer had failed to follow such procedure, the court, applying the law laid down by the Supreme Court in V.K. Khanna (vide Supra), set aside the charge sheet framed by the Enquiry Officer.

1997 LIC 2828:

Madan Mohan Thakur Vs. State of Nagaland and others:

"Once rules applicable to the establishment are clear as to how enquiry is to be conducted. Such rules should be complied with.

1993 (3) SCC 433:

Babu Verghese and other V. Bar Council of Kerala and other.:

"It is the basic principle of law long settled that if the manner of doing a particular of law long settled that if the manner of doing a particular act is prescribed under any statute, the act must be done in that manner or not at all. The certified standing order being a stator force and binding both the petitioner and the respondent, and it confers the right to the respondent to initiate disciplinary action against the workers and impose punishment, the respondent shall follow the procedure contemplated in the certified standing orders, and otherwise the respondent shall allow to reap its natural consequences.

1994 III LLJ 877:

Ganesh Rajan Servai Vs. Bennett Coleman and Company Ltd.:

“The termination orders passed against the petitioners were in contravention of the certified standing orders governing the service conditions of the petitioners. In that case, the termination orders would be void *ab initio*. They do not exist in the eyes of law. Such termination orders could not have been passed by the company without following the proper procedure laid down in standing order. In other words, the termination orders are not non est-

AIR 670, 1985 SCR (2) 1065:

The Workmen of the Food Corporation of India Vs. Food Corporation of India 1985:

“No employer since the introduction of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 and contrary to its certified standing orders as statutorily required to be drawn up under the Industrial Employment (Standing Orders) Act, 1946 can dispense with the service of any workman without complying with the law in force. Any termination of service contrary to the provisions of the standing orders and provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 would be void.”

10. This court has already upheld the fairness of enquiry and in deciding so, this court had taken note of the contention of petitioner and had rejected the same. The petitioner was never prevented from issuing reply to charge sheet. In fact, the petitioner himself has marked Ex. P1, which is the letter, dated 26-8-2009 in reply to the charges levelled against him and the same was also marked in the enquiry proceedings. The said reply was also considered by Enquiry Officer before giving his findings. The petitioner has not shown any prejudice in the charge sheet being served upon him along with enquiry notice. Unless prejudice is shown, an enquiry, which is otherwise fair and proper cannot be set aside for mere defects. Hence, the contention of petitioner cannot be sustained at this stage for the reasons that this court has already come to the conclusion that the enquiry conducted by the Enquiry Officer is fair and proper.

11. Further while deciding the fairness of domestic enquiry, the Labour Court will also look into the fairness in the findings of Enquiry Officer, sufficiency of evidence adduced before him and the proof of misconduct levelled against the workers. Only when all these criteria are satisfied, the labour court holds an enquiry to be fair, just and proper. Once the enquiry is held to be fair, just and proper and in accordance with

the principles of natural justice, it also means and includes that fairness in the conclusions arrived at by the Enquiry Officer and there is absolutely no scope for re-appreciating the evidence on record adduced before Enquiry Officer.

12. The learned counsel for the respondent relied upon the following decision:

1963 AIR 1914:

Sur Enamel And Stamping Works (P) Ltd. Vs. Their Workmen:

An enquiry cannot be said to have been properly held unless, (i) the employee proceeded against has been informed clearly of the charges levelled against him, (ii) the witnesses are examined-ordinarily in the presence of the employee-in respect of the charges. (iii) the employee is given a fair opportunity to cross-examine witnesses, (iv) he is given a fair opportunity to examine witnesses including himself in his defence if he so wishes on any relevant matter, and (v) the Enquiry Officer records his findings with reasons for the same in his report.

2007 STPL (LE) 39288 SC:

U.P. State Road Transport Corporation Vs. Vinod Kumar:

“8. Labour Court, without appreciating the fact that in the absence of challenge to the legality or fairness of the inquiry report the court should be reluctant to either interfere with the finding recorded by the punishing authority or the quantum, held that the charge of misappropriation has not been proved against the respondent and, thus, punishment of removal from service is harsh.

10. As stated in the preceding paragraphs, the respondent had confined his case only to the conclusions reached by the Enquiry Officer as well as the quantum of punishment. Therefore, since the respondent had not challenged the correctness, legality or validity of the enquiry conducted, it was not open to the Labour Court to go into the findings recorded by the Enquiry Officer regarding the misconduct committed by the respondent.”

The judgment makes it absolutely clear that unless the legality and validity of enquiry is not challenged by the worker, he cannot question the conclusion reached by Enquiry Officer. In the present case, the legality of domestic enquiry is specifically challenged by the petitioner and this court has held that the enquiry is proper and hence there is absolutely no scope to look into the fairness in conclusion arrived at by Enquiry Officer regarding proof of misconduct of petition.

13. The learned counsel for the respondent has also relied upon the following decision:

1964 STPL (LE) 3026 SC:

Hind Construction and Engineering Co. Ltd. Vs. Their Workmen:

“It is now settled law that the tribunal is not to examine the finding or the quantum of punishment because the whole of the dispute is not really open before the tribunal as it is ordinarily before a court of appeal. The tribunal's powers have been stated by this court in a large number of cases and it has been ruled that the tribunal can only interfere if the conduct of the employer shows lack of *bona fides* or victimisation of employee or employees or unfair labour practice. The tribunal may in a storage case interfere with a basic error on a point of fact or a perverse finding, but it cannot substitute its own appraisal of the evidence for that of the officer conducting the domestic enquiry though it may interfere where the principles of natural justice or fair play have not been followed or where the enquiry is so perverted in its procedure as to amount to no enquiry at all.

It is not out of context to mention here that parties to an industrial dispute can lead additional evidence before this Labour Court (apart from minimal evidence required to substantiate their pleadings and counter pleadings and mark the enquiry proceedings) only when the enquiry is found to be defective by the Labour Court. If the enquiry is found to be fair and just, there is no scope for letting in additional evidence by either parties and therefore, once the enquiry is held to be fair and proper, the sufficiency of evidence adduced before the Enquiry Officer and the reasoning of his conclusions cannot be challenged by workman. Hence once this court has held that the enquiry is just and proper, there is absolutely no scope for the petitioner to question sufficiency of evidence before the Enquiry Officer or to contend that the charges of misconduct were not proved in the enquiry.

14. Thus when an enquiry is held to be fair, it only means that the court is satisfied of all the aforementioned ingredients and therefore what is left to be decided is only the quantum of punishment.

15. The learned counsel for the respondent has submitted that the misconduct committed by petitioner is grave in nature as he has assaulted the superior officer, using abusive language and attempted to create unrest and disharmony amongst the workers. He further submitted that the petitioner intended to disrupt the production activities of the respondent and that too at the time when he was not on duty and he crossed all lines of decency and exhibited violence, which is

proved in domestic enquiry and he cannot escape scot free after committing grave misconduct of assaulting an officer and that too when he was in probation as punishment for similar misconduct. In order to prove his contention, the learned counsel for the respondent relied upon the following decisions:

CDJ2008 SC 670:

Usha Breco Mazdoor Sangh Vs. Management of M/s. Usha Breco Ltd. & Another.

“33. Assault, intimidation are penal offences. A workman indulging in commission of a criminal offence should not be spared only because he happens to be a union leader, The Act does not encourage indiscipline. It will be a matter of some concern if the opinion of the Enquiry Officer can be totally ignored despite the fact that the management is precluded from adducing any fresh evidence before the Labour Court. A union leader does not enjoy immunity from being proceeded within a case of misconduct”.

CD/2005 SC 250:

Mahindra and Mahindra Ltd. Vs. N.B. Naravade:

“As noticed herein above atleast in two of the cases cited before us, *i.e.* Orissa Cement Ltd. (Supra) and New Shorrck Mills (Supra), this court held: “PUNISHMENT of dismissal for using of abusive language cannot be held to be DISPROPORTIONATE.” In this case all the forums below have held that the language used by the workman was filthy. We too are of the opinion that the language used by the workman is such that it cannot be tolerated by any civilised society. Use of such abusive language against a superior officer, that too not once but twice, in the presence of his subordinates cannot be termed to be an indiscipline calling for lesser PUNISHMENT in the absence of any extenuating factor referred to herein above.”

1999-III LLJ (supp)-1455:

Venugopal V. and another Vs. Management of Reed Relays and Electronics Ltd. Madras and another:

“10...The last contention of the learned counsel for the appellants relates to the award of extreme penalty of dismissal on the appellants, which according to the learned counsel for the appellants, was not called for in this case. We are unable to accept the above contention.

...in our opinion, courts should not encourage the use of indecorous or indecent and violent behavior, exhibiting thereby indiscipline. Such acts on the part of the workmen should be discouraged at any cost.

Since the appellants were terminated from service for serious misconduct proved and established before the Labour Court, no interference is called for in the finding of the Labour Court, which is based on the evidence let in, in this case..."

(1990) 1 MLJ 355:

The Management of South India Sugars Ltd. Vs. The Presiding Officer, Additional Labour Court And Anr:

"There can be no doubt that the second respondent is guilty of such riotous and disorderly behaviour which would deprive him of his gratuity under the Payment of Gratuity Act also. Section 4 (2) (vi) of the Payment of Gratuity Act provides that notwithstanding anything contained in sub-clause (1), the gratuity payable to an employee may be wholly or partially forfeited if the service of such employee have been terminated for his riotous and disorderly conduct or any other act of violence on his part.' Section 9 of the Payment of Bonus Act, 1965, provides that an employee shall be disqualified from receiving bonus under the Act, if he is dismissed from service for riotous or violent behaviour while on the premises of the establishment. Thus, the Legislature has taken care to discourage statutorily any riotous or violent behaviour on the part of the employee. It cannot be said that when a worker or employee is found guilty of riotous or violent behaviour, the punishment of dismissal is extreme or that it is shockingly disproportionate to his misconduct".

16. The petitioner as well as the respondent have filed their written arguments along with judgments, supporting their respective contention after careful perusal of the evidence on records and the written arguments filed by both parties along with the precedents relied on by them, this court is of the considered opinion that the misconduct levelled against by the respondent stands duly proved in the defence evidence held by the respondent.

17. Further this court had already held *vide* its order dated 1-2-2013 in I.A. No. 4/2013 that the enquiry conducted by the respondent is fair and in adherence of the principle of natural justice. Therefore, the only question that is left for determination is regarding the question of punishment imposed by the respondent in order to justify the punishment of dismissal the respondent as relied upon the above judgments. However it is observed that the fact and circumstances prevailing in the above referred judgments is completely different from the fact contained in the present case. Therefore, this court of the considered opinion that the judgment relied on by the respondent cannot be of any help to the respondent, on the other hand the petitioner has relied on the following judgments:

1984 AIR 914, 1984 SCR (3) 169:

Ved Prakash Gupta Vs. Delton Cable India (P) Ltd.:

There is nothing on record to show that any previous adverse remark against the appellant had been taken into consideration by the management for awarding the extreme penalty of dismissal from service to the appellant even if he had in fact abused in filthy language Durg Singh and S.K.Bagga, we are therefore of the opinion that the punishment awarded to the appellant is "shockingly disproportionate regard being had to the charge framed against him. We are also of the opinion that no responsible employer would even impose in like circumstances the punishment of dismissal to the employee and that victimisation or unfair labour practice could well be inferred from the conduct of the management in awarding the extreme punishment of dismissal for a flimsy charge of abuse of some worker or officer of the management by the appellant within the premises of the factory. We therefore, hold that the termination of the appellant's service is invalid and unsustainable in law, and that he is entitled to reinstatement with full back wages and other benefits including continuity of service."

2002(3) L.L.N. 314:

Damodaran Vs. Presiding Officer, II Additional Labour Court, Madras and another:

"The order of dismissal imposed upon the delinquent, a Secretary of the labour union for using abusing words was grossly disproportionate and should the punishment was modified."

1983 SCC (L and amp; S) 26:

Rama Kant Misra Vs. State of Uttar Pradesh; and ORS:

"Dismissal for use of indiscreet, indecent or threatening language to the superior in the course of long unblemished service is an excessive punishment."

1984(2) S.C.C. 281:

V.D. Prakash Gupta Vs. Delton Cable India (P) Ltd.:

"The dismissal of a workman in the said circumstances (the allegation of use of indecent language was held to be proved) amounts to unfair labour practice requiring reinstatement with full back wages."

1983 SCC (L and amp; S) 26:-

Ramakant Misra Vs. State of Uttra Pradesh and Others:

“The unskilled workers culture is that they would raise their voice while making their grievance. The following passage in this regard in Ramakant Misra’ case is usefully extracted hereunder:-

“It is said that language discloses a threatening posture it is the subjective conclusion of the person, who hears the language because voice modulation of each person in the society differs and indiscreet improper, abusive language may show lack of culture but merely the use of such language on one occasion unconnected with any subsequent positive action and not preceded by any blameworthy conduct cannot permit an extreme penalty of dismissal from service. Therefore, we are satisfied that the order of dismissal was not justified in the facts and circumstances of the case and the court must interfere.”

1995 (6) SCC.237:

Palghat BPL and PSP Thozhilali Union Vs. BPL India Limited:

“The Labour Court had discretion under section 11-A of the Industrial Disputes Act to consider the quantum of misconduct and the punishment. In view of the surging circumstances, viz., the workmen were agitating by their collective bargain for acceptance of their demands and when the strike was on, the settlement during conciliation proceedings, though initially agreed to, was resiled later on. They appear to have attacked the officers when they were going to the factory. Under these circumstances, the Labour Court was well justified in taking lenient view and in setting aside the order of dismissal and giving direction to reinstate the workmen with a cut of 75% of the back wages up to the date of the award. In our considered view, the discretion exercised by the Labour Court is proper and justified in the above facts and circumstances. The High Court had not adverted to these aspects of the matter, it merely had gone into the question whether the act complained of is a misconduct”

AIR 1996 (1) LLJ 982; (AIR 1996 SC 255):

Ram Kishan Vs. Union of India:

“When abusive language is used by anybody against a superior, it must be understood in the environment in which that person is situated and the circumstances surrounding the event that led to the

use of the abusive language. No straight jacket formula could be evolved in adjudging whether the abusive language in the given circumstances would warrant dismissal from service. Each case has to be considered on its own facts.”

1984(1) LLJ 546: (1984 Lab IC 658):-

Prakash Gupta Vs. Messrs Delton Cable India (P) Ltd.:

“The workman was a Security Inspector under the Security Officer on a total monthly salary of ₹ 581. He was dismissed on the charge of abusing co-worker in filthy language. There was no previous adverse remark against the workman shown and extreme penalty of dismissal was held to be disproportionately excessive and dismissal was set aside and reinstatement was ordered with full back wage.”

1982 Lab IC 1790:

Rama Kant Misra Vs. The State of Uttar Pradesh:

“The workman was a low paid employee. It was alleged against him to have used threatening language. The Supreme Court considering that there being no blame-worthy conduct of the appellant during the period of 14 years’ service, he rendered prior to the date of misconduct and the misconduct consists of language indiscreet, improper or disclosing a threatening posture. When it is said that language discloses a threatening posture, it is the subjective conclusion of the person, who hears the language because voice modulation of each person in the society differs and indiscreet, improper, abusive language may show lack of culture.”

1989 (1) LLJ 71: (1989 Lab IC 1043):

Scooter India Limited, Lucknow Vs. Labour Court, Lucknow:

“The Labour Court had granted reinstatement with 75 per cent back wages. The Labour Court had observed that, ‘the workman had unfortunately to blame himself for much of bad blood which has developed between him and the management, and therefore, his conduct, motivated by ideals which are not relevant, has been far from satisfactory, in so far as it was rough, bordering on rudeness and with highly exaggerated sense of his duties.’ This was not a case where filthy abuses have been given by educated employee to his superior. Even that case, 25 per cent back wages were denied and the Hon’ble Supreme Court has confirmed the said order passed by the Labour Court, Lucknow.”

18. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Ved Prakash Gupta Vs. Delton Cable Private India Ltd.*, has held that the dismissal of an employee on charge of abuse of some office or management in the absence of any past misconduct is disproportionate to the misconduct levelled against him similar were the view of High Court in *Damotharan Vs. Preceeding Officer reported in 2002(3) LLJ 314* where the High Court held that punishment of dismissal of running abusing languages is highly disproportionate.

19. The petitioner had also relied on *Scooter India limited Lucknow Vs. Labour Court Lucknow* reported in 1989 (1) LLJ 71 where in the Hon'ble Court of Lucknow had held that a punishment of reinstatement with 75% back wages could be a reasonable punishment for misconduct of using abuse languages. The fact and circumstances that prevails in the above three judgments are similar to the fact and circumstances existing in the present case. Therefore, relying upon those judgments, this court of view that the punishment of dismissal for misconduct committed by the petitioner is grossly disproportionate and therefore, in exercise of its power under section 11(a) of Industrial Disputes Act, this court is inclined to interfere with the punishment given to the petitioner. Hence, the petitioner can be reinstated with continuity of service and 50% of back wages. As already discussed above, the misconduct committed by the petitioner has been proved through the enquiry proceedings. Hence, I feel that the petitioner has to realise himself for the misconduct committed by him, for which the minimum punishment has to be imposed on them. Therefore, it is ordered to cut one increment of the petitioner with cumulative effect.

Typed to my dictation, corrected and pronounced by me in the open court on this the 15th day of May, 2013.

T. MOHANDASS,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Puducherry.

List of witness examined for the petitioner :

PW.1 — 7-11-2012 — Raja

List of witness examined for the respondent :

RW.1 — 13-3-2013 — R. Vijayalaxmi

List of exhibits marked for the petitioner :

Ex.P1 — Letter, dated 26-8-2009 sent by the petitioner to the Enquiry Officer.

Ex.P2 — Enquiry report

Ex.P3 — Letter, dated 17-6-2010 sent by the petitioner.

Ex.P4 — Termination order of the petitioner, dated 22-6-2010.

Ex.P5 — Complaint sent by the petitioner to the Conciliation Officer.

Ex.P6 — Reply sent by the respondent, dated 9-9-2010.

Ex.P7 — Standing order of the respondent company

Ex.P8 — Visitor's register, dated 29-7-2009.

List of exhibits marked for the respondent :

Ex.R1 — Copy of the charge sheet

Ex.R2 — Signatures of the petitioner in the enquiry proceedings.

Ex.R3 — Enquiry report in English and Tamil

Ex.R4 — Undated reply letter sent by the petitioner.

Ex.R5 — Original letter of authorisation to Vijaylaxmi, dated 13-3-2013.

Ex.R6 — Copy of suspension order issued to the petitioner, dated 29-7-2009.

Ex.R7 — Copy of the suspension order sent by the respondent through registered post.

Ex.R8 — Copy of the letter by Enquiry Officer to the petitioner, dated 6-8-2009.

Ex.R9 — Entire enquiry proceedings

Ex.R10 — Second show cause notice to the petitioner, dated 31-5-2010.

Ex.R11 — Letter of petitioner to the respondent, dated 8-6-2010.

Ex.R12 — Letter of respondent to the petitioner, dated 10-6-2010.

Ex.R13 — Copy of termination order in English and Tamil along with courier slip and returned postal cover.

Ex.R14 — Copy of show cause notice to the petitioner, dated 5-12-2001.

Ex.R15 — Copy of show cause notice to the petitioner, dated 28-11-2001.

Ex.R16 — Copy of Advisor letter, dated 20-8-2002

Ex.R17 — Copy of warning letter, dated 19-11-2004.

T. MOHANDASS,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Puducherry.